The University of Chicago

JAMES SHIRLEY'S *THE TRAITOR*

EDITED FROM THE QUARTO OF 1635 WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
AUGUST, 1941

By
JOHN STEWART CARTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1945

The University of Chicago

JAMES SHIRLEY'S *THE TRAITOR*

EDITED FROM THE QUARTO OF 1635 WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
AUGUST, 1941

By

JOHN STEWART CARTER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1945

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

NOTE

Certain references in the following pages are to parts of the dissertation which are not included in this "essential portion." The complete dissertation is to be found in the University of Chicago Libraries.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41533916_0117

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Editions

1. Quarto 1635

The Traitor was first published in 1635. In every respect this edition is a somewhat better than normal seventeenth-century play quarto. It was entered on the Stationers' Register in 1634 thus:

> 3° Novembris
> William Cooke. Entred for his Copie vnder the hands of Sir HENRY HERBERT / and both the wardens a Play called the Traytor &c by James Shirley.....vjd.[1]

The quarto duly appeared with the title-page:

> THE / TRAYTOR. / A / TRAGEDIE, / VVRITTEN / BY / [rule] / IAMES SHIRLEY. / [rule] / ACTED / By her Majesties Servants. / [ornament] / [rule] / LONDON: / Printed for William Cooke, and are to be sold / at his Shop at Furnivals Inne-gate / in Holborne. 1635.

The Short Title Catalogue (22458) notices two variants at the Huntington library. I have seen the Huntington copies, and while there are variants, there are no more differences between the two copies than is usual between one copy of a book printed in the seventeenth-century and another. Both STC and the earlier Library of Congress catalogue card spell "TRAGEDIE" (l. 3), "TRAGIDIE," but I have never seen a title-page with that variation. Both the British Museum and the Library of Congress copies read, "TRAGEDIE."[2]

Recognizing, however, that such differences do exist throughout quartos, I have examined ten copies of the 1635 quarto,

---

[1] Edward Arber, A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A.D. (London: Privately printed, 1875-1877), IV, 329.

[2] Since the attention of the librarians of the Library of Congress was called to the error, a new card has been issued with the correct spelling, "TRAGEDIE."

and have fully collated five. Those which I have collated, and whose variants appear in the notes are, the University of Chicago library copy (the basic text, hereafter referred to as C); the Newberry library copy (CN); the two copies at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California (Hn1, Hn2); and my own copy (Ca). On particular readings I have consulted the copies in the Yale and Harvard libraries, the copy belonging to Mr. Alan Stevenson of Chicago, and for the title page, the copy in the Library of Congress, and that in the British Museum recorded in its catalogue.

The collation is: Quarto, A whole sheet (one blank leaf of which is usually wanting) + B to K (nine sheets, each of four leaves) + L (one quarter-sheet, one leaf, usually signed). A consists of: one blank leaf unsigned and wanting (except in my copy described below); $[A1]^r$ title-page as above; $[A1]^v$ blank; $A2^r$ dedication "TO THE RIGHT / HONORABLE, WILLIAM CAVENDISH, / Earle of New-Castle, Viscount Mansfield, / Lord Boulfouer [for Bolsover] and Ogle."; $A2^v$ dedication, dedication concluded and signed "IAMES SHIRLY" and catchword "To"; $[A3]^r$ "To my Friend Maister Iames Shirley, / the Authour." / signed "WILL ATKINS of Grayes Inne."; $[A3]^v$ "THE SCENE, / Florence." / , "The Persons." and catchword "The". B-L1^v consists of: $B1^r$ head-title "THE TRAYTOR." and beginning of text; $B1^v$-$[L1]^r$ (or -$L1^r$) text continued; $[L1]^v$ (or $L1^v$) text concluded and "FINIS." [A1] is unsigned, but all other gatherings are signed like B; B, B2, B3, except L which is signed L in all copies except Chicago. An ornament appears on $[A1]^r$; an ornamental head-piece and an ornamental "T" on $A2^r$; a type-key border at the head, and a different type-key border at the bottom of $[A3]^r$; a type-key border at the head, and a different type-key border at the bottom of $[A3]^v$; and a type-key border at the top, and an ornamental initial letter "D" on $B1^r$. These ornaments may be seen in the notes on these pages as they appear. The pages of the quarto are not numbered. The running-head, "T H E T R A Y T O R." appears (with the initial "T's" larger than the other letters, and with slight variations in letters, but none in pointing) on every page from $B1^v$ through $[L1]^v$. $B2^r$ reads "T H E T R A Y T O O R," in all copies and this is the only variation of any significance. The "O" in each running-head is slightly larger than the other letters of the word. I think that the running-heads were not set up once

and then transferred from one forme to the next. The same letters are often used, but had the compositor or compositors of C-L used the running-heads of B, the "T H E T R A Y T O O R." would have been repeated. If it be argued that the mistake could have been corrected in C through L and allowed to stand on $B2^{r}$, it should be noted that, unless the entire B gathering were completely printed before work was begun on the rest of the quarto, it is difficult to imagine that the compositor of C should not make a stop-press correction of such a peculiar and obvious error. Besides the copies which I have completely collated, I have examined the Harvard, Yale, and Stevenson copies on this reading, and they all have "T H E T R A Y T O O R." That there was at least one stop-press correction in the quarto is certain. The evidence for this appears in the Notes on [$E4^{v}$], p. 38.

The appearance in my copy of the blank leaf of gathering A is fortunate. The blank leaf is pasted to the back of the title-page (blank) presumably by some nineteenth-century bibliophile, to hold in place a repair of a small tear in the lower left-hand corner. It is the same paper, and the chain lines and water mark are in the correct position to make it the missing [A2]. I am unable to separate the blank leaf from the title-page without destroying one, or both, but I think there is little doubt in the matter. That the appearance of the blank leaf is a matter of some importance is brought out in an article by George Watson Cole, "A Description of the Huntington The Second Comedie of Pub. Terentius, called Eunuchus, 1629."[3] The Second Comedie has two alternative titles: one for each book seller who is to sell it. Both of these are a part of the first sheet, and one was to be cancelled by the binder in every case. Mr. Cole says:

> Are we at all absolutely sure that any copy of a book lacking one of the leaves of the first or preliminary sheet can be satisfactorily and accurately described until a copy has been found which contains all of the leaves, and especially if copies are known with differing imprints containing the names of two or more stationers as in the case of the book here described? Both title-

---

[3]George Watson Cole, "A Description of the Huntington The Second Comedie of Pub. Terentius, Eunuchus, 1629," Library, 4th ser., II (1921-22), 272-274.

> pages are printed on the original sheet A, in neither has the title-page been cancelled and a cancel printed, as is often the case where the original title-page has been cancelled and another, printed on a separate leaf, tipped in to take its place.[4]

Because of the presence, then, in Ca of the blank leaf of the A gathering we are "absolutely" sure that The Traitor is satisfactorily described, and has no such alternative title at least on the leaf usually missing.

In general the quarto is very well printed. It does, however, contain the kinds of error constantly met with in seventeenth-century editions of plays. There are occasional turned letters, although even "u" for "n," or "n" for "u," does not occur more than a half dozen times; letters of the wrong font ($G2^r$, particularly), but only occasionally; and incorrectly spaced words especially in the prose passages. The type-face is clear and almost pleasant; the type is Roman. There are some peculiar individual types, notably a long swash italic capital "A" and "D," a Roman capital "S" which can scarcely be distinguished from italic, a long Roman "J" (used as "I"), and a Roman capital "L," which is very good looking. The quarto does not have the large capital "U" characteristic of Norton (cf. the Norton Gamester, 1637, and The Duke's Mistress, 1638). This is mentioned here as the first in a series of arguments which ascribe the book to either John or Nicholas Okes rather than to Norton (STC 22458).[5]

Other peculiarities of type include the use, frequent but without meaning, of several kinds of interrogation points both italic and Roman, Roman "D," "S," and "L" where italic would be expected ($G2^r$ particularly), a slightly larger comma than that belonging to the font, and an apostrophe which looks like a small comma, and is sometimes turned in the printing.

By far the most striking peculiarity of the quarto is the use through gatherings G, H, I, and K of a very long capital "J" for capital "I." This, although there is an outside chance that it may have been intended by the type founder for an "I," I have reproduced as "J" because of its appearance. I have examined the gatherings to ascertain on which forme, inner or outer,

---

[4] Ibid., p. 274.

[5] Cf. especially the note on p. 1, l. 15.

the long "J's" appear, and they appear on both. The fact that the long "J's" do not appear in L is without significance, as only one leaf of that signature is printed. The fact that they do not appear in A through F may indicate one of two possibilities: A-F may have been set up by a different compositor, or G-K may have been set up when the "J's" had been put back incorrectly with the "I's." That the printing house should have run out of "I's" seems to me too unlikely to deserve consideration, although I checked the entries to Cooke, the publisher, and to Norton and Okes, the possible printers, in Arber for the years 1634-1636 to discover if any particularly big job or number of jobs were on hand. There were none which could explain a shortage of "I's." Although such an extensive foul case is surprising in a decent printing house, several features of the text, such as punctuation and the regularity of the use of italic type, make me fairly sure that the quarto is the work of one compositor.

The lining of the verse is usually correct, although Gifford changes some lines in order to reduce to more formal iambic pentameter Shirley's conversational and loose line. Several speeches obviously in prose are printed with a capital letter at the beginning of the line, but these are short speeches, and force of habit--either Shirley's or the compositor's--is enough to explain the mistake. Such passages are discussed in the notes on the individual passages. The treatment of prose and verse is, however, much better than that in the 1639 Maid's Revenge (Cotes). Of Cotes's lineation, Mr. Albert Howard Carter says, it "is no worse, perhaps even better, than that of most seventeenth-century printers."[6]

The punctuation of the quarto, though different from twentieth-century usage, is normal for the seventeenth-century. It is distinctly better than normal for printed plays of the time, because it is much more consistent. Any one used to reading plays in seventeenth-century editions becomes accustomed to dropped punctuation at the end of lines, and the inconsistent punctuation within lines--periods where there should be commas, and no punc-

---

[6] James Shirley, The Maid's Revenge, ed. Albert Howard Carter (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of English, University of Chicago, 1940), p. viii.

tuation where there should be periods even by Simpson's elastic rules.[7] There is surprisingly little of this in the quarto. Unfortunately no statistical studies of the practices in regard to punctuation in the various printing houses have been made; so there is no numerical basis of comparison, but there are not more than a half dozen commas for periods, even considering those which Simpson allows at the end of speeches, in this quarto. The most striking consistency of the quarto, however, is the use of the colon within speeches. The period is used within a speech fewer than twenty times. Three of these times it is a senseless error; once a stage direction intervenes; twice there is a complete change in the person addressed; and once it is used to mark an aside. In the remaining instances it is used in a normal manner. Such usage throws the burden of the full stop upon the colon and semi-colon. The comma is used, as regularly in plays before the restoration, to separate independent clauses. The colon, however, is much more widely used in The Traitor for this purpose than is usual. For example, where Mr. Howard Carter[8] notices three colons so used in sixteen pages in The Maid's Revenge (Cotes, 1639), in two pages, taken at random in The Traitor, there are ten. The appearance of a period within a speech is discussed in the notes on the individual lines.

In general, however, there is no other great difference between the punctuation of The Traitor and that noticed by my brother in his edition of The Maid's Revenge. With this exception, then, a much lighter punctuation than that of the twentieth century is probably the best way to describe it. The comma is regularly used between independent clauses where we should require a semi-colon, and introductory words, phrases, and clauses are often left without any punctuation. Vocatives and imperatives, also, are more often than not unseparated from the rest of the sentence, and appositives are likely to be punctuated at the end, but not the beginning of the apposition (e.g., "Pisano my noble friend, is come"). Interrogation points and exclamation points are used in the middle of sentences, and the sentences continue without capitalization. The interrogation point is used as an exclamation

---

[7] See Percy Simpson, Shakesperian punctuation (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), passim.

[8] The Maid's Revenge, ed. Carter, p. vii.

point several times, and each use is noted in the notes as it occurs. Where either is omitted unjustifiably according to modern standards, one can invariably tell from the structure of the sentence that a question or an interjection is meant.[9] The usual ending for an interrupted speech is a dash, and not the comma, semicolon, or colon which Simpson observed as marking a broken speech in the first folio of Shakespeare.[10] My brother also notes this change in usage in connection with The Maid's Revenge;[11] so the practice in Oke's and Cotes's shop was approximately the same at this date. The punctuation of non-restrictive adjectival clauses, and of adverbial constructions which interrupt the normal flow of the sentence is, from our point of view, also light. The comma before "and" and "but" is very regular, as is particularly strong punctuation, the colon for comma, towards the end of a long sentence. It is impossible within the limits of this work to notice all the differences between the punctuation of a 1635 printer and that of our day, but readings offering even the slightest difficulty are recorded together with the change made in 1692 and in Gifford in the notes. Departures from the norm of 1635 are also noted. With the exception of the use of colons instead of periods within speeches, all of these observations on punctuation are also true of Cotes's The Maid's Revenge of 1639.

The second immediately noticeable consistency of the 1635 The Traitor is the practice in regard to italics. Proper names are italicized except in stage direction where the direction itself is italic, and the name, therefore, is Roman. This rule is followed with such regularity that I noticed more variations of practice in the beautifully printed and expensive large-paper 1833 Gifford edition of the play than in the 1635 quarto. I had counted seven variations of practice in Gifford to the two in the quarto when, of course, I stopped. A set practice, or rule of style on this point was very rare in the seventeenth century. I examined over eighty nearly contemporary plays in the University of Chicago and Newberry libraries to see if this particular prac-

---

[9] Simpson, ¶ 37. [10] Ibid., ¶¶ 9, 28, 32, 36.

[11] The Maid's Revenge, ed. Carter, p. viii.

tice in regard to italic type were anywhere else observed, and found that the following quartos made the distinction:

> The Honest Whore, Part II (Elizabeth Aldee, 1630)
> The Honest Whore, Part I (Nicholas Okes, 1635)
> [neither of these plays with the same regularity as The Traitor.]
> The Sophister (J. O[kes], 1639)
> The Noble Stranger (J. O[kes], 1640)
> The Martyrd Soldier (J. Okes, 1640)[12]

Thus the first edition of Shirley's The Traitor, with the exception of the regularity with which it observes its self-imposed rules concerning periods within speeches, and the italicizing of proper names and stage directions is a normal quarto for its time. There are some, but not many, bibliographical problems connected with the printing. These are discussed in the Notes, which also contain the argument for Okes as opposed to Norton (STC, 22458) as printer, and the facts about the publisher, Cooke.

2. The Quarto of 1692

Although there is no transfer of Cooke's rights in the play in The Stationers' Register, Richard Parker and Sam. Briscoe brought out in 1692 a quarto of The Traitor. The title-page of this printing reads:

> THE / T R A Y T O R. / A / T R A G E D Y: / WITH / Alterations, Amendments, and Additions. / [rule] / As it is now Acted at the Theatre Royal, by their Majesties Servants. [old English type] / [rule] / Written by Mr. Rivers. / [rule] / [four line type-key decoration] / [rule] / L O N D O N, / Printed for Richard Parker at the Royal Exchange, and Sam. / Briscoe in Covent Garden, over against Wills Coffee-House. / MDCXCII. /

The title-page and preliminaries are reproduced in photostat in the Notes on these parts of the book as they appear in connection with the 1635 quarto. I have used the University of Chicago Library's copy of 1692.

The collation is: Quarto, A unsigned, whole sheet (two leaves of which, presumably blank, are wanting) + B to H (seven sheets, each of four leaves). [A] consists of: $[A1]^{r}$ title-page as above; $[A1]^{v}$ blank; $[A2]^{r}$ dedication "To The Right Honour-

---

[12] Cf. the Note on Okes as the printer, p. 1, l. 15.

able Donnough Earl of Clancarty, Viscount Muskery, and Baron Blarney."; [A2]^{v} "The Persons Names."; B1^{r} head-title "THE TRAYTOR." and beginning of text; B1^{v}-[H4]^{r} text continued; [H4]^{v} text, text concluded, and "FINIS." [A1] and [A2] are unsigned, but all other gatherings are signed like B: B, B2. There is a type-key ornament on the title-page [A1]^{r}, and a large Roman initial "T" on [A2]^{r}; the same type-key makes the head border for B1^{r}, and there is a large initial "D." The running head "The T R A Y T O R." appears on every page (sometimes badly shaved) from B1^{v} through [H4]^{v}. On [D4]^{v} this appears as "The T T R A Y T O R.".

The chief interest of this quarto is not, however, bibliographical, except as bibliographical evidence is of use in the two related problems which present themselves: the authority of the quarto for editorial purposes, and the authority of the ascription to Mr. Rivers.

In general, the authority of a second quarto for editorial purposes, let alone a second quarto printed over a half a century after the first, is so negligible as to make a complete collation a waste of the editor's time. If, however, the second quarto can be established as proceeding not from the first quarto but from an independent manuscript, probably contemporary with the first quarto, it deserves somewhat more consideration. I think that I have established enough probability that this is the case in the second quarto of The Traitor[13] to make it worth my while to collate 1692, and to record whatever variants (such as in spelling, punctuation, or idiom) are not explainable by the fifty-seven years difference in time of printing.

In taking this position on the relationship of the second to the first quarto, I am at variance with most scholarly opinion, which also varies from scholar to scholar. The late Robert Stanley Forsythe says:

> The "alterations, amendments and additions" with which the play was published [in 1692] are very few, and consist, indeed, chiefly of omissions. As a

---

[13] Cf. the Notes on p. 10, ll. 26-27; p. 46, l. 8, and elsewhere throughout the text.

> matter of fact, it appears that the text of the tragedy was probably printed from the prompter's book of the original play.[14]

Forsythe gives no reason for his conclusion, but George MacKendrick Gregory[15] has presented an argument which should be answered. Mr. Gregory says:

> Many pieces of such evidence are available from a comparison of the 1692 printing and that of 1635; but only a few outstanding ones are here presented--sufficient, however, to indicate that the 1692 printing was taken from Shirley's of 1635.[16]

Mr. Gregory, to prove that 1692 was set up from 1635, cites two instances where cut speeches of 1692 end in commas where they should properly end in periods,[17] one case of incorrect speech ascription,[18] one case in which a stage direction (which does not even exist in 1635) has crept into the later text,[19] and four instances where he thinks there is incorrect or in sufficient reference because of a cut.[20] Each of these instances is answered in my notes as it occurs,[21] but two of his proofs are the result of incorrect reading of 1635, and should be mentioned here. Mr. Gregory says:

> Another matter that indicates perfunctory copying from the 1635 play appears in Act I, Scene ii, l. 249, which, in the 1635 printing, reads: "Your owne hight, that my scale may not expect". The word my is logical in its use at this point, but there is a type imperfection that separates the letter y from the letter m.

---

[14] Robert Stanley Forsythe, Shirley's Plays and the Elizabethan Drama (New York: Columbia University, 1914), p. 33.

[15] George MacKendrick Gregory, Two Studies in James Shirley ("A digest of matter selected from a dissertation entitled 'James Shirley's The Traytor' accepted by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Duke University, in 1932"; n. p., 1935), passim.

[16] Ibid., p. 7.

[17] Ibid., p. 89.

[18] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[19] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[20] Ibid., pp. 13-16.

[21] Cf. the notes on p. 19, l. 37; p. 20, ll. 1-5; p. 24, ll. 15-22; p. 10, ll. 26-27; p. 26, l. 14; and p. 43, ll. 11-25; p. 55, ll. 30-33; p. 58, ll. 11-32; p. 69, ll. 12-16.

> This separation is marked by a blur or blot--possibly a small particle of dirt or foreign matter prevented the letters' coming close together--that makes the word look something like *may*. A close examination reveals that the word is *not may*; the context calls not for may but for *my*; and yet the line in the 1692 printing reads: "Your own height, that may scale may not expect", the possessive pronoun having been made an auxiliary verb, with the result that the substantive *scale* is made a verb which can not possibly fit the sense of the line. This again evidences a hasty copying from Shirley's play, the defect in type having been mistaken for the letter *a*.[22]

In every copy of the 1635 quarto I have examined, "may" appears as "may." The "a" is completely and clearly printed, and there can be no doubt that "may" is the word set up in type. The interpretation of the passage with "may" appears in the Notes on p. 15, l. 33, but even if Mr. Gregory's ingenious emendation represents what Shirley wrote, the error need not have proceeded from the printed page. What the 1635 compositor saw in the manuscript, the 1692 compositor could see as well.

Mr. Gregory's second misreading occurs in the same act, some sixty-two lines later. Mr. Gregory says:

> A similar error is in Act 1, Scene ii, where lines 311 and 312 read:
>
> Dare boldly sweare, his honor is as free
> From any treason, as my selfe,
>
> After the word *free* is a heavy mark about one quarter of an inch long, and having something of the appearance of a dash. The sense does not call for a dash; the mark is much longer than a dash would normally be; and the printer of Shirley's 1635 play has, in every other place where a dash is called for, used a series (usually four) of very short, rectangular marks which look something like oversize square periods. Yet after the word *free* in the 1692 printing is a dash. Once more the inevitable conclusion is that the edition of 1692 was taken from Shirley's of 1635.[23]

The dash after "free" in all of the quartos which I have examined is not much different from the other dashes of the quarto. It consists of four separable, but run together, marks which very nearly resemble those on the typewriter: "----." Since both of Mr. Gregory's readings occur in the same gathering it is possible

---

[22] Gregory, pp. 9-10. [23] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

that he is speaking of a copy in which these readings are doubtful. Examination of further quartos has, however, proved these, as well as his other bibliographical proofs, to be of little weight. The interpretation of the lines as punctuated in 1635 appears in the Notes on p. 17, l. 29.

The strongest evidence for the theory that 1692 was set up from 1635 Mr. Gregory does not notice. $B1^r$, the first page of the text in both quartos is set up in exactly the same way: head-piece, the title in two lines, "Actus Primus" between rules, initial "D", catchword, "Pis.". This, considering that 1692 is on larger paper, and contains omissions, could hardly be a matter of accident. All in all, however, I think that the several cruxes are better explained[24] by assuming a separate source for the later quarto, and explaining the identical nature of the two B1 rectos, as a rare circumstance brought about by the fact that two printers can, and often do, use the same lineation at the head of a play, and that the spacing, and not design, brings "Pis." as the catchword. There is no other bibliographical similarity between the quartos, and even on this leaf, the italic practice is different.

The second problem raised by the 1692 quarto is that of authorship. Although the title-page can be read as attributing only the "Alterations, Amendments, and Additions" to Mr. Rivers, the printer's dedication to the Earl of Clancarty leaves little doubt that the printers considered, or wished the public to consider, that Mr. Rivers was the author. They say:

> I will not slander it with my Praise, it is Commendation enough, to say the Author was Mr. Rivers.[25]

One other reference in the same year ascribes the play to Rivers. Peter de Motteux printed the following notice in The Gentleman's Journal of which he was the editor:

> The Traytor, an old Tragedy, hath not only been revived the last Month, but also been reprinted with Alterations and Amendments: It was supposed to be

---

[24] Textual evidence of an independent manuscript is found in the Notes on p. 10, ll. 26-35; p. 12, l. 14; p. 17, l. 29; p. 19, l. 37; p. 20, ll. 1-5; p. 22, l. 31; p. 24, ll. 15-22; p. 26, ll. 3, 14; p. 27, ll. 7-8; p. 43, ll. 11-25; p. 55, ll. 30-33; p. 58, ll. 11-32; and p. 69, ll. 12-16.

[25] Cf. the photostat of the 1692 dedication on p. 88, and the Notes on p. 3.

> Shirly's, but he only usher'd it in to the Stage; The Author of it was one Mr. Rivers, A Jesuite, who wrote it in his Confinement in Newgate, where he died. It hath always been esteemed a very good Play, by the best Judges of Dramatick Writing.[26]

Although there may have been some talk of the authorship at the time, as far as this entry is concerned, Motteux may be depending on the quarto for his information concerning Rivers's authorship. The most famous "Mr. Rivers, A Jesuite" is one Anthony Rivers who flourished, according to the account in the DNB, s. v., around 1616. It is this Rivers that Gregory[27] and others[28] consider as meant by the 1692 references. Gillow, however, has unearthed another Anthony Rivers nearer to the time, and one who died in Newgate. The entry in Gillow reads:

> Anthony Rivers, vere Whitelocke. He is probably identical with the "John Rivers" who Prynne says was discharged from prison, giving bond for his appearance in 1635. Subsequently he was rearrested and died in Newgate, a confessor of the faith under the sentence of death.
>
> Both Dyce (Shirley, "Dramatic Works," I, xiv, and Fleay, "Biog. Chron.," s. v. "Rivers") treat the ascription to Rivers as a dishonest attempt to claim the play for a Roman Catholic, but there is nothing improbable in the story, for James Shirley (q.v.) [there is no entry for James Shirley in Gillow] was a Catholic, and no doubt would be well acquainted with Mr. Rivers, who certainly would not have issued the play under his own name.[29]

---

[26] The Gentleman's Journal or the Monthly Miscellany, April 13, 1692, p. 21, cited by Arthur Huntington Nason, James Shirley Dramatist (New York: Arthur H. Nason, 1915), p. 432.

[27] Gregory, pp. 5-6.

[28] Halliwell believed the claim of the 1692 title-page, and accords the 1692 quarto a separate entry with the alterations as by Rivers. (J. Halliwell [-Phillips], A Dictionary of Old English Plays [London: J. R. Smith, 1860], p. 250.) Schipper also sees some doubt as to authorship at the time of the first quarto by reason of the dedicatory verses which read:

> for Friend I stand not here
> To praise, or in thy quarrel spend my ieere
> On some third man.

Schipper's opinion is discussed in the Notes on p. 5, ll. 10-11. (Jakob Schipper, James Shirley, Sein Leben und Seine Werke [Wien: W. Braumüller, 1911], p. 45.

[29] Joseph Gillow, A Literary and Biographical History, or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, (London: Burns and Oates, [1885-1902]), s. v. "Rivers."

Whatever may be thought of Gillow's argument, his candidate for the authorship is certainly more likely than the earlier Rivers who is not mentioned as having returned to England after 1610, and, as far as we know, was never in Newgate.[30] Neither Rivers, however, was known to have written any plays, and Gillow's candidate engaged in no literary activity. Miss Evelyn May Albright has suggested to me one other Rivers as a possibility, George Rivers, who wrote The Heroinae; or the lives of Arria, Paulina, Lucrecia, Dido, Theatilla, Cypriana, Aretaphila (London: R. Bishop, for J. Golby, 1639). This Rivers, however, is mentioned nowhere but in the STC and the library catalogues, and there only as the author of this one book.

Over against these very vague claims of authorship must be placed the following indisputable facts. The play was licensed by the Master of the Revels for presentation as Shirley's on May 4, 1631,[31] and entered for publication as Shirley's again, in The Stationers' Register, on November 3, 1634. There is no reference to any Rivers, save George, as the author of anything before 1692, and George Rivers was not a Jesuit, so far as we know, and never was in Newgate. From the language of the 1692 dedication we should expect the "Mr. Rivers" to be well known in 1692. If he were responsible only for the alterations, we should expect him to be acutely aware of the problems connected with stage production and actor's business. No Mr. Rivers suggested so far, or even discoverable, fits any of these qualifications. If he were responsible for the whole play, as Gillow and the 1692 dedication assert, then the play would be one of those rare literary freaks, the single work which is a great success.[32] But more than that, it would be a single work which is not claimed for its rightful author until after a fifty-seven year interval during which every known mention of it refers it to another incomparably better

---

[30] One connection of Shirley's with the Jesuits not hitherto mentioned is the fact that "Mr. Vincent Cane, my loveing friend" mentioned in the will as to have "the sume of Twenty pounds to be Disposed by him according to a former agreement betwixt Us" (Nason, p. 160), is probably the Jesuit noticed in the DNB, s. v.

[31] Joseph Quincy Adams (ed.), The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert. . . .("Cornell Studies in English;" New Haven, Conn., 1917), p. 31.

[32] Cf. the discussion under "Stage History."

known author whose every known stylistic mark the play bears.[33] With the exceptions noticed, all scholarly opinion discredits the 1692 ascription of the play to Rivers.

The reputation of the 1692 quarto need not necessarily be completely blackened because of the false claim of authorship. Certainly the quarto presents a text of the same play which was printed in 1635, and presents it as the play was presumably produced after the Restoration.[34] The variations, whatever their authority, are almost always interesting, and although they almost always consist of omissions, omissions can be significant as interpolations. I have, therefore, recorded in the collation notes all the omissions and the few additions of the later quarto. These are done with considerable theatrical skill, and I have allowed myself the luxury of commenting on that skill in my notes. It is possible, therefore, to reconstruct from these notes the manner in which the play was produced at the later date. It is always of great interest to observe an expert hand at work on any play, and that that hand in this instance is in all probability not Shirley's does not affect the history of the play as a theatrical piece. I have, of course, not attempted to "correct" the 1635 quarto by 1692, but have merely noted the differences, and in one or two instances suggested the acceptability of the 1692 changes as emendations.

3. Gifford's Edition of 1833

The last independent edition of The Traitor and the one from which all subsequent editions have been derived, is that of William Gifford. Gifford died in 1826, and at that time left thirty-two Shirley plays edited and ready for publication.[35] Six years later, the Reverend Alexander Dyce brought out the complete works. The title-page reads:

---

[33] Gregory, pp. 17-20.

[34] Cf. the section of the introduction entitled, "Stage History."

[35] Dyce, in the preface to the edition of 1833, sig. [aa]^{r}.

The dramatic works and poems of James Shirley, now first collected; with notes by the late William Gifford, Esq. and additional notes, and some account of Shirley and his writings, by the Rev. Alexander Dyce. In six volumes....London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. MDCCCXXXIII.

The second play of the second volume is The Traitor (pp. [94]-187.

The first impression which a modern reader familiar with seventeenth-century editions has of Gifford's edition is one of constant annoyance. But once Gifford's purpose and method are understood, his "unwarranted" liberties, and disregard of bibliographical nicety become highly intelligent, and his general editorial policy as sensible as it is consistent. He was editing the plays for the enjoyment of the cultivated, but not learned nineteenth-century Englishman, and he thought of the plays as they would be produced in his own day. Thus he divides the play into scenes, but his division is certainly the division implied by the quarto. The quarto does not mark scenes as "Scene I" or "Scene II" as does Gifford, but at each division in Gifford there is a marked change of action, and even bibliographically there is a space of some lines, and a centered stage direction. I have noticed all Gifford's divisions in the notes, the reasons for them, and his location of the scene. These are no more than any producer who did not use the extremely elastic and non-localized Jacobean stage would have to take into account when producing the play. In each case they are the result of a careful attention to the text, and while unnecessary to the equally careful reader, are of value to the casual one. The same observations are true of the expanded stage directions, for although they are unusually full in the quarto, Gifford often suggests to the casual reader the business which must accompany the action. Where I have disagreed with him, or thought that the stage business which he suggests only one of a number of possibilities, I have said so in my notes.

Perhaps because the text is such a good one, Gifford's important emendations do not number over six. All these are recorded and commented on in the notes, as well as the more annoying silent (but unimportant) changes and the bracketed (but equally unimportant) metrical emendations.

Gifford's chief fault as an editor in this play is his insistence upon a rigid verse pattern, and his expansion of Shirley's very characteristic, and conversational contractions. His

over-weening desire for completely regular iambic pentameter sometimes leads him to distort the lineation of the quarto and emend otherwise harmless lines so that the play looks at times like a schoolman's Latin tragedy. This is particularly noticeable when a group of short exchanges in the dialogue are relined into the most formal sort of stychomythia. His expansion of contractions also removes much of the contemporary flavor of the language. "Ha," he invariably expands to "have," and even "don't" to "do not." So zealously does he pursue anything the least colloquial, that sometimes he spoils the accent of the verse, and even the nineteenth century reader must have puzzled over many of the lines before he "heard" them spoken. I have not recorded all of Gifford's expansions, but only those which disturb or change the meter; I have, however, recorded all instances of re-lineation because a good part of the time Gifford is correct, and to omit those which I think incorrect would give the impression that Gifford's ear was infallible.

It would be a mistake to generalize on Gifford's value as an editor from his treatment of The Traitor alone. In this case, the quarto is so well printed that little editorial re-arrangement is necessary. His treatment of a more confused quarto may be studied in A. H. Carter's edition of The Maid's Revenge.[36]

4. Editions Derived from Gifford

The following editions of The Traitor have appeared since 1833:

> The Works of the British Dramatists....[Edited] by John S. Keltie....Edinburgh....1872.

The Traitor occupies pp. 505-528; the book was reissued in 1882, and 1887.

> The Mermaid Series. James Shirley. With an Introduction by Edmund Gosse, M.A., Clark Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge. "I lie and dream of your full Mermaid wine."--Beaumont. London: T. Fisher Unwin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. [n.d.]

The Traitor is the second play.

In view of the fact that they are based substantially on Gifford, I have not collated them nor given their variant readings.

---

[36] The Maid's Revenge, ed. Carter, pp. xi-xiii.

5. Photostatic Reproduction

In 1932 George MacKendrick Gregory edited The Traitor under the title of James Shirley's "The Traitor" from photostatic plates. This was a dissertation accepted by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University. I have not seen a copy; the Librarian of Duke University Library informs me that it is lost. Sections of the "Introduction," however, have been reprinted, and references from that are recorded in the Notes.

6. The Present Edition

Principles of transcription. The emphasis in this edition of The Traitor is primarily bibliographical. In transcribing the text of the University of Chicago copy, I have been guided by one principle above all: I have reproduced the reading of the quarto as exactly as possible on a modern typewriter. That is to say, although the quarto from gathering G on uses a long Roman "J" for upper case "I," I have used the typewriter's "J"; likewise, when the quarto uses a "v" in a few cases where we should use "u," I have kept the "u." There are so few cases of contractions such as "redēption," for "redemption," that I have also kept even these. Because there is no equivalent of the seventeenth-century long "s," on the modern typewriter, and because no discernible distinction was made between the two lower case "s's" at the time, I have not reproduced the long "s." I have not been able to reproduce the ornaments, large capitals and the like, but I have indicated their presence in the text, and inserted photostatic copies of all the important ones in the Notes. I have used the convention of underlining to indicate italics, and that of underlining twice to indicate a font of type larger than that of the letters in the same line; but even on the same page, a letter underscored twice may not be of the same size in the quarto as another letter so underscored. Because the running-head "T H E T R A Y T O R." consistently has larger initial "T's" than the rest of the line, I have not underlined these. I have made no distinction between swash italic and regular italic since they are of the same size, and to underline them twice would give the wrong impression. When a word is partly in italic and partly in Roman, I have, of

course, underlined only the italic letters (cf. gathering G, the speech ascriptions especially).

In the matter of spacing, since the exactly regular spacing of the typewriter can never be made to approximate the elasticity of movable type, I have been forced to follow modern usage. Spacing, even today, is a matter of typographical justification, and there is no reason to suppose that it did not follow the same necessity in the seventeenth-century. It is very unlikely, then, that any printer will ever be identified by any particular practice in spacing between words or before and after punctuation. It is positive that no author, not even Jonson, could have had anything to do with such spacings, and so to retain them would be at once pedantic and confusing. In the spacing between words, then, I have not run two words together even though they appear to be so printed in the quarto unless one or more copies has the words correctly spaced, and the order of the copies for that gathering might possibly be determined by such a variation. On the other hand, I have not separated run together words nor run together separated words that conceivably may have represented either seventeenth-century usage, or the manuscript from which the play was set up. Thus "atother," "Common wealth," "an other" are written as they are spaced in the quarto. Where it has been impossible to tell, for example, whether "an other" or "another" is meant, I have followed modern usage. In an uncrowded line, I have considered as two words groups of letters separated by an en.

Because it is never confusing, and sometimes helpful, as in the otherwise unmarked divisions into scenes, I have kept the spacing before and after stage directions, and their relative place on the page. This I have done by the arbitrary rule of placing the first letter of such a direction under the letter in the line above which is above it in the quarto. Thus,

Lor. Sir bee confident---and perish.

Enter Morosa, and Oriana in the Garden.
Mor. You shu'd not rashly give away your heart,

means, typgraphically, that there is a space of three lines between Lorenzo's speech and the direction, that the "E" of the "Enter" appears under the "r" of "Sir" in Lorenzo's speech, and that Morosa's follows, without further space, on the direction. On the other hand, I have normalized the uneven left-hand margin of the

page, and have regularly allowed two spaces after the speech ascriptions.

Turned letters I have indicated in the collation notes, and since turned "n" can on the typewriter be written "u," and turned "u," "n," I have used these in the text itself. Although turned "m," when printed, looks like printed "w," I have not used "w" because there is little similarity between the letters on the typewriter, and the reading would be unnecessarily confusing. Finally, I have recorded no instances of what appear to be turned "s," since it is impossible to determine always with any certainty whether the top of the "s" is merely worn, or actually the bottom.

Occasionally I comment in the collation notes on instances of damage to the text, but insufficient inking and bad type are not noticed unless some textual question is involved. Inasmuch as the text is reproduced as a bibliographical entity, I have numbered its pages from one to eighty, beginning with the title-page and including the title-page verso which is blank; the play proper, then, begins on page seven. I have not followed the admittedly experimental line numbering of Howard Carter in his edition of The Maid's Revenge. The interest of the play is not wholly bibliographical, and to treat it only as a bibliographical problem is unjust. Gifford does not number lines, but the prose passages which Gifford lines as verse would confuse the reference from one edition to the next if any attempt were made to number lines of verse. I have, therefore, steered the middle course, and numbered only lines of speech on the individual page. To facilitate reference to the play which is usually given from Gifford's edition, I have given Gifford's act and scene number in the right hand margin of my page.

The collation notes.--The collation notes at the foot of each page record all the variants in the five copies of the quarto text. They also record all significant departures in 1692 and in Gifford from the text of the quarto of 1635. Such departures are considered significant when they alter the sense of a passage, clarify the presumed intention of the quarto, or enable the reader to choose among the various possible interpretations of the quarto, or even when the intended meaning in 1692 and Gifford is doubtful. For 1692 such verbal changes are few, but they are likely to be important in determining the relationship between 1692 and 1635;

sometimes they help the sense, and sometimes they are probably misprints. For Gifford, such changes include his silent emendations, his alterations for which he gives the reading of the "old copy," and his bracketed additions to the text. The collation notes include Gifford's brackets and even the number he uses to refer to a particular note. This number has been retained as the simplest form of indicating that Gifford has a note on the word or line in question, and that that note will be found reproduced in the Notes following p. 80. Unless the bracket appears, all Gifford's emendations recorded at the bottom of my pages should be considered as silent in his text. The other editors I have not collated, although I have consulted them on readings which caused any doubt. In no case did I find that they differed from Gifford; so in general it may be assumed that any reading of Gifford's is also followed by Keltie and Gosse, although these last may differ in spelling or punctuation.

Collation notes will be found which record differences among the various editions in spelling and capitalization of words, but no such difference has been noted merely for the sake of recording it, unless the respelling can be construed as resulting in a possible difference in sense or as correcting an error in 1635. I have recorded Gifford's expanded contractions such as "I have" for the quarto's "I've" only when they alter the meter of the line. Occasionally a modernized spelling will be recorded when the quarto spelling obscures the immediate understanding of the text. I have taken the modernized spelling from 1692 for the collation notes whenever this has been possible.

Changes in punctuation are recorded for 1692 before and after omissions in that quarto because the information is of use in determining the relationship between that text and 1635, but in general aside from proximity to such omissions no change in punctuation is noted unless it indicates a choice between possible meanings, gives a significant interpretation of meaning, or makes clear a grammatical structure not readily apparent to a reader fairly familiar with Jacobean systems of punctuation. The mistakes in the quarto, senseless periods and the like, are clarified in the collation notes by the record of the 1692 and Gifford punctuations.

Finally, all divergences in lineation, whether in 1692 or

Gifford are recorded in the collation notes, and commented on in the Notes following p. 80.

The page of the text and the collation notes do not carry my opinions except in so far as they record my reading of the 1635 or 1692 quarto and may be followed by a single word such as "unnecessarily." All judgments of mine, and all of my comments on the value of emendations, the significance of the variants from one copy of the quarto to the next, and the advisability from any point of view of the omissions in 1692 appear in the Notes. The existence of such matter is indicated in the collation notes by an asterisk. If there is no textual difficulty, and no significant variation between editions, and yet I have felt the need for comment on a phrase or line, there will be no indication on the text page, but the note will appear indicated by the proper line number.

Every entry in the collation notes begins with the line number or numbers of the reading in question. This is followed by the reading of the text; if several words are involved, I have given the key words separated by four dots. This reading is separated from what follows by a square bracket. When the note has been made to indicate a variant reading, this reading follows the bracket; in turn this is followed by an indication of the source of that variant. All copies of 1635 and 1692 not mentioned in a collation note are to be considered as having the reading of the basic t e x t (the University of Chicago copy). If 1692 or the edition by Gifford is not mentioned, the edition not mentioned is to be considered as agreeing substantially with that of the first quarto. If there is more than one variant, the second is separated from the first by a semi-colon. For example, this note,

> 29 but the] but th[e]e CN; but thee. 1692; [none] / But you; Gifford*

means: The words "but the" on line 29 are printed "but the" in all copies of the quarto but Newberry; the Newberry copy has the words with some letter not decipherable as "e" printed in the space for the first "e," while the second "e" is printed clearly (if there had been no letter, printed, but the space existed, the note would have read "but th e"); 1692 prints "but thee," but adds a period; Gifford adds the word "none" in brackets, begins a new line with "But," changes "the" (or "thee") without comment to "you,"

and inserts a semicolon after the "you." All editions since Gifford follow Gifford in lineation and emendation. Finally, the asterisk indicates that the whole note is commented on in the Notes.

Symbols in the collation notes and their meanings are:

The copies of the first quarto

(asterisks after the abbreviations for quartos of copies indicate that such copies have been examined in microfilm)

Q	all the copies of the quarto which I have examined	
C	the basic copy of the quarto in The University of Chicago	
Ca	the copy of the quarto in my possession	
CN	" " " " " "	The Newberry Library, Chicago
Hn1*	" " " " " "	Henry Huntington Library, San Marino, California, catalogued as C 22458-69435
Hn2*	" " " " " "	Henry Huntington Library, catalogued as C 22458-69436

The Yale, Harvard, British Museum, Library of Congress, and Stevenson copies are not referred to in the collation notes, and therefore require no symbols.

Later editions

1692 The second quarto, published in 1692 (see pp. x-xvii)

Gifford The six-volume edition of Shirley published in 1833 by William Gifford and Alexander Dyce (see pp. xvii-xix)

Other symbols

....	Omissions made by me from any of the texts dealt with
/	The end of a printed line in any of the texts dealt with
*	A direction to a fuller discussion in the notes
[]	An addition to the text as quoted in the notes or introduction. I have made no additions to the text, but in the collation notes the square brackets indicate that I am reading a doubtful letter.

Other conventions are the same as those used in the transcription of the text (see pp. xx-xxv).

The notes.--Throughout this introduction there has been occasion to mention the notes, which follow page eighty, a number

of times; a complete statement of their purpose would therefore be repetitious. In general they contain my comment on the collation notes, bibliographical explanations concerning the material in the front matter of the quarto, observations on the various editions, and elucidation of words, punctuation, and grammatical constructions in the text not readily understood by any one acquainted to a fair degree with the theatre and plays of Shakespeare.

B. The Writing of the Play

1. The Date of Composition

The Traitor is dated by external evidence as having been written before May 4, 1631, the date it was licensed by Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, for performance.[37] The presumption is that it was written not long before this date, but since three of Shirley's plays were licensed in this year, one less than two weeks later, the possibility that it was composed at somewhat earlier date is good. The plays licensed to Shirley in 1631 are: The Duke (probably, according to Nason, the same as The Humorous Courtier), on May 17, and Love's Cruelty, on November 14. Before the year begun in May was over, The Changes, and Hyde Park were also licensed, and Love's Tricks was published under the title of The Schoole of Complement.[38] Inasmuch as no other external evidence is available, and internal evidence is so unreliable, sometime before May, 1631 must serve as the date of composition. It would be theoretically possible, but not strictly allowable under licensing regulations, for alterations to be made between the date of licensing for performance and the time of its entry in the Stationers' Register, November 3, 1634. There is no evidence at present that such alterations were made.

2. The Source

A hint of the plot of The Traitor occurs in the twelfth novel of Margaret of Navarre's Heptameron. It is the barest outline, however, of Shirley's play: a nameless duke in Florence makes the proposal to a nameless gentleman of his court, that the gentleman play pander for the duke to the gentleman's own sister. The gentleman loves his sister and family honor too much; so he kills his sister, places her in bed, and sends the duke to her. When the duke has discovered that she is dead, the gentleman rushes in, and to deliver the state from a tyrant, kills the duke. The gentleman and his servant then escape to Venice, and later to Turkey. Inasmuch as Shirley uses many historical details, and

---

[37] Adams, p. 31.

[38] Nason, pp. 43-44.

and assigns the correct names to the historic personages involved, it is highly probable that he used some history of Florence for the main part of his plot, and it is not at all necessary that he have seen, or having seen, remembered the account in The Heptameron at all. The only history of Florence actually popular in England in Shirley's time was Machiavelli's which ran through a great number of editions.[39] This, however, contains no reference to the story. The earliest editions of Varchi, Storia Fiorentina, or Segni, Istorie Fiorentine, both of which contain the story, are 1720 and 1723 respectively;[40] so whether Shirley used an Italian history or one published in England and now lost sight of, must remain a matter of conjecture for the present. Certain details, however, must have proceeded from some historical source, and as Forsythe thinks Segni the most similar,[41] and as I have been able to discover no other, most of the references in the notes are to Segni. For Varchi[42] I have relied in the main on Henry Edward Napier's Florentine History,[43] which is based on Varchi. Specific resemblances to the accounts in any of the three, are mentioned in the notes when such resemblances occur. In general, however, the historical events around which The Traitor centers are correctly and clearly stated by Forsythe:

> The characters in the tragedy agree with the historical personages thus: Alexander, Duke of Florence=Alessandro de Medici; Lorenzo=Lorenzino de Medici; Amidea=Luisa Strozzi, Caterina Ginori, and Laldomine Sal-

---

[39]Mary Augusta Scott, Elizabethan Translations from the Italian ("Vassar Semi-Centennial Series;" Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), pp. [393]-442.

[40]The British Museum Catalogue records these editions; they are earlier than any listed by Brunet, Jöcher, or any of the other standard lists of such books. Both, however, existed in manuscript before 1600. Cf. Bernardo Segni, Istorie Fiorentine dall' Anno MDXXVII al MDLV, ed. G. Gargani (Firenze: Barbera, Bianchi, 1857), pp. vi-ix, and Benedetto Varchi, Lezioni sul Dante e Prose Varie, ed. Guiseppe Arbio (Firenze: "Societa Editrice delle Storie del Nardi e del Varchi;" 1841), pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

[41]Forsythe, p. 153.

[42]Benedetto Varchi, Storia Fiorentina, ed. Lelio Arbib (Firenze: Societa Editrice delle Storie del Nardi e del Varchi, 1838-1841).

[43]Henry Edward Napier, Florentine History (London: Moxon, 1846-47). Forsythe, p. 437, gives this date, I think, incorrectly as 1857. At least I have been able to discover no 1857 edition.

viati [the name given to the lady chosen by the duke in Napier, Segni and Varchi respectively. There is no hint in any of them for the character of Amidea as developed by Shirley] Cosmo=Cosimo de Medici; Sciarrha=Lorenzino and Scoronconcolo; Florio=Guilano de Medici; ....Petruchio=Scoronconcolo....

Alessandro besought Lorenzino to make an assignation for him with the latter's aunt, Caterina Ginori. Finally Lorenzino agreed to bring a meeting about. He told the Duke that it was arranged, and that the two were to meet secretly at his house for the sake of the lady's reputation. Lorenzino left the Duke in his chamber after securing his sword and fastening the door, and with a bravo called Scoronconcolo (whom he had prepared to commit a murder for him) set upon the Duke and killed him in spite of his struggles. The two then fled. Cosimo de Medici who was not quite eighteen, was chosen to succeed Alessandro (Napier, Florentine History, Bk. III, Chap. 1. Based on Varchi).

Segni (Istorie Fiorentine, p. 314) says that Lorenzino promised to procure his sister Laldomine, widow of Alemanno Salviati, for the Duke, who wished for a son whom he could be certain was his own. Lorenzino promised to bring the two together when his mother was absent. She had left Florence on the day of the assassination to visit her younger son, Guiliano.

Varchi (Storia Fiorentina, V, 106) says that Luisa Strozzi, to whom Alessandro made advances, was poisoned by her relatives in order to save her from him.[44]

The additions which Shirley has made to the information included in these accounts are readily apparent to any reader of the play. There is no hint of the characterization or motivation of any of Shirley's dramatis personae. The high minded Sciarrha, the Iago-like Lorenzo, the dilettante Cosmo, and the long suffering Amidea cannot be explained in terms of the source. They are all stock figures from the drama of the time, and are best understood in relation to the stage of 1631. Such relationships and parallels I have recorded in my notes.

The two subplots of The Traitor, the Pisano-Amidea,-Cosmo-Oriana, and the Depazzi-Lorenzo plot have no known source. Such general romantic material as the first, and such general comic material as the second are unlikely ever to be traced to any convincing original. Forsythe examined five hundred and twenty plays, and found none. Again, however, the characters and incidents involved were part of the stock and trade of all persons writing at the time, and whenever parallels exist, I have noted that fact in

---

[44]Forsythe, pp. 154-155.

the notes.

In addition to historical sources, and sources found in English plays, the possibility of a Spanish source has been considered. The results here have been equally negative, for without massive parallels in substance between the two plays, the material of The Traitor is so utterly conventional, that to designate any play as its source, is bound to be unconvincing.[45]

---

[45] Cf. Albert Desoff, Über englische, italienische, und spanische Dramen in den Spielverzeichnissen deutscher Wandertruppen ("Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte," I [Leipzig], 1901), 420 ff.

C. Stage History

Of the stage history of The Traitor we have several records. It was licensed as by James Shirley in the office book of Sir Henry Herbert on May 4, 1631.[46] It was protected by the Lord Chamberlain for Beeston (August 10, 1639).[47] And after the Restoration, there is ample proof that it held the stage. It is in the list of Red Bull plays performed after 1660,[48] and it was presented by the King's Company on the sixth and twenty-second of November, 1660.[49] "The Traytor" is in Downes's list of "Old Plays ....Acted but now and then; yet being well Perform'd....very Satisfactory to the Town."[50] And that Pepys saw it four times between 1660 and 1667,[51] attests its continued popularity. Dessoff mentions a performance by an English company during a carnival in 1661 in Dresden which may have been of The Traitor.[52] Nicoll records, further, that the "Warrant dated Nov. 26, 1674 for plays [performed before royalty by the Theatre-Royal Company]

---

[46] Adams, p. 33.

[47] Gerald Eades Bentley, The Jacobean and Caroline Stage (Oxford: Clarendon, 1941), I, 330-331.

[48] Adams, p. 82.

[49] Ibid., p. 116. Cf. also Allardyce Nicoll, A History of Restoration Drama 1660-1700 (Cambridge: University, 1923) p. 82.

[50] John Downes, Roscius Anglicanus, ed. Montague Summers (London: Fortune, n.d.), p. 9.

[51] Cf. Helen McAfee, Pepys on the Restoration Stage (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1916), p. 126:

"November 22, 1660. I to the newplayhouse and saw part of the 'Traitor,' a very good Tragedy; Mr. Moon [i. e., Mohun] did act the Traitor well.

"October 10, 1661. To the Theatre....where the King came to-day, and there was 'The Traytor' most admirably acted; and a most excellent play it is.

"January 13, 1664-65. To the King's house, to a play, 'The Traytor,' where unfortunately, I met with Sir W. Penn, so that I must be forced to confess it to my wife, which troubles me.

"October 2, 1667. To the King's house to see 'The Traytor,' which still I like as a very good play."

[52] Dessoff, Studien z. vergl. Litt, I (1901), 421 ff.

acted from Mar. 26, 1674 to Nov. 10, 1674 (L. C. 5/141. p. 73)" lists "Octo 20 The Traytor £ 10."[53] And the quarto of 1692 followed at least one performance at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane of the altered play.[54]

In the eighteenth century, Shirley's Traitor was apparently supplanted by alterations. Genest records two performances of the play, both at Drury Lane; the first was presented on the nineteenth of October, 1703 under the title, "Traytor, or Tragedy of Amidea,"[55] and the second on October 10, 1704;[56] although Forsythe presumes these to be the version of 1692,[57] the subtitle suggests a new adaptation in which the emphasis, like that of Evadne, is on the heroine. The several later performances of The Traitor recorded by Nicoll are of the adaptation supposed to have been written by Christopher Bullock.[58] And in the nineteenth century, Shirley's play survives in and was supplanted by Evadne, by Richard Sheil, which was immensely popular in both England and America.[59] But if The Traitor preserved in the quarto of 1635

---

[53]Nicoll, Restoration, pp. 306-307.

[54]Cf. title-page and further comments in the Notes on p. 6.

[55][John Genest], Some Account of the English Stage (Bath: Rodd, 1832), II, 295.

[56]Ibid., p. 316. [57]Forsythe, p. 33.

[58]Allardyce Nicoll, A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750 (Cambridge: University, 1925), p. 301. Cf. also Genest, II, 648, and the section of this Introduction called "Adaptations;" further information on the production will be found in the Notes on p. 6.

[59]Genest (VIII, 699) says that this alteration was acted thirty times; Wilson records thirty-five performances in Philadelphia between 1835 and 1855 (cf. Arthur H. Wilson, A History of the Philadelphia Theatre, 1835 to 1855 [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania; Philadelphia, Penn.: University of Pennsylvania, 1935]); Mr. Carson records performances in St. Louis in 1832, 1836, and 1837 (cf. William G. B. Carson, The Theatre on the Frontier [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1932], pp. 322, 324, 325; and Brown (cited by Forsythe, p. 33) records a performance in New York as late as the thirteenth of December, 1881. The complete entry in Allardyce Nicoll reads: "Evadne; or, The Statue (C.G.W. 10/2/1819; S.W.M. 10/11/1845). L. 114 M [30/1/1819]. 8° 1819 [5 editions]; Dicks 25; Oxberry vol. xiv; Lacy, vol. xxiv; B. D. vol. iv." Cf. Allardyce Nicoll XIX Century Drama, 1800-1850 (Cambridge: University, 1930) II, 390.

was ever acted after the appearance of Bullock's version, I have been able to find no unquestioned record of such a performance.[60]

---

[60] I have looked in vain through the works listed by Howard Carter in his edition of The Maid's Revenge, pp. xxxvi-xxxviii.

D. Adaptations

The Traitor was revived with alterations at the Theatre Royal (Drury Lane) in 1692 as by Mr. Rivers. Because of the minor nature of the alterations, this appears under "The quarto of 1692," in this introduction.

In 1718 further alterations were made on The Traitor[61] by Christopher Bullock and published with the following title-page:

> The Traytor: a tragedy; as it is acted at the new theatre in Little Lincolns-Inn-Fields. Reviv'd, with several alterations. London, W. Chetwood [etc.] 1718

These alterations are discussed at some length in the Notes on p. 6, and the record of the performances appears under "Stage History." Christopher Bullock (1690-1724) was the son on William Bullock (?1657-?1740), a famous comedian.

By far the most popular and most important adaptation of the play is Richard Sheil's Evadne: or the Statue. I have been unable to locate the first edition of this, but the title-page of the second as recorded in Nason[62] reads:

> Evadne; or, The Statue; A tragedy, In Five Acts: As performed at the Theatre Royal, Covent-Garden. By Richard Sheil, Esq. Second Edition. London 1819

As there is no copy of this in the vicinity, I have used Samuel French and Son's edition in the possession of the University of Chicago. The title-page reads:

> No. LII. French's Standard Drama. Evadne: or, The Statue. A Play in Five Acts. By Richard Sheil. With the stage business, cast of characters, costumes, relative positions, etc. New York: Samuel French & Son. London: Samuel French. [n.d.]

Evadne itself was further altered, and its last form is that which appears in Dick's British Theatre (London: J. Dick, 1864-1872).[63]

---

[61] Genest, II, 648

[62] Nason, p. 418.

[63] Nicoll lists five 1819 editions and four subsequent editions. Cf. Nicoll, XIX Century, II, 390. He does not notice French.

According to Genest[64] and Nicoll[65] Evadne was first performed at Covent-Garden in 1819. French's edition, however, gives the date as 1818,[66] and quotes the preface of the London edition (1819) as follows:

> The author has employed a part of the fable of Shirley's 'Traytor,' in the construction of this plot. In that tragedy, a kinsman, and favorite of the Duke of Florence, contrives to excite in him a dishonorable passion for the sister of a Florentine nobleman, as the means of procuring the murder of the Duke by the hand of the injured brother, and thus opening the way for his own elevation to the throne.
>
> To that extent only, the plot of this tragedy is derived from Shirley. The incidents, situations, distribution, characters, and language, such as they are, the author hopes he may be pardoned for observing, are his own. It will, perhaps, be thought, that this detracts from his claim to the merit of originality--he does not think so. No one contends against the originality of 'Douglas,' because Home took his plot from an old ballad, and even profited by the 'Merope' of Voltaire. Rowe's 'Fair Penitent' is a still stronger case; that fine tragedy is modelled on Messinger's 'Fatal Dowry;' Otway and Southerne rarely invented their plots.
>
> The author trusts his introduction to these names will not be misinterpreted. He mentions them for the purpose of justifying himself, by the authority of their example.[67]

Of Sheil himself, and his most successful play, French's introduction says:

> It was when a young man, and engaged in the study of the law, that Mr. Shiel [sic] betook himself to dramatic writing, with the view of increasing an income, which was by no means too abundant for his wants. The success of "The Apostate," his first production, was encouraging; and "Bellamira" and "Evadne" soon followed. The last named-play is that by which he is most favorably known in the theatrical, if not the literary world. It was written for Mrs. O'Niell, who, in the part of the heroine, justified the author's estimate of her powers, and won new laurels for herself and him. The following remarks upon the play and its performance, by one who witnessed one of its earliest representations, seems to us just and appropriate:--

---

[64] Genest, VIII, 699 ff.

[65] Nicoll, XIX Century, II, 390.

[66] French, in the introduction to his edition, pp. [A1]^{v}, vii.

[67] French, in the introduction to his edition, [A2]^{r}.

To the plot and incidents, by which it is worked out, we can offer at most unqualified praise. It has quite enough of unity for all the purposes of the drama. The guilty ambition of Ludovico, is the spring which sets every part in motion. Every incident flows naturally and intelligibly from its immediate and assigned cause, and all conduce to bear him on nearer towards the object of his desires--the crown--till at length, in the last scene, he is on the point of seizing it--but at the very moment when he seems to feel its golden round upon his brow, and in imagination presses the sceptre in his grasp, retribution falls upon him like a thunderbolt, and closes his career.

The events on which the chief interest of the piece depends, are brought about with great skill. They are every one made 'probable to thinking.' It is impossible for Vicentio to resist the evidence which Ludovico offers him of Evadne's falsehood, when coupled with the changing of the pictures--it is impossible for Colonna to refuse the office which Ludovico forces upon him, of killing the King--and it is impossible for the King himself--young and not wholly depraved as he is--to withstand the appeal which Evadne makes to him, in the shadowy presence of her great and glorious ancestors. The minor incidents, too--the treachery of Olivia--the combat between Colonna and Vicentio--the intended sacrifice of his hand, which Vicentio makes to Olivia, &c., are all absolutely essential to the progress of the plot, and yet none have the appearance of being forced, or out of place.

The charm of the piece is the character of Evadne. She is a woman in the truest and strictest, yet most delightful sense of the term. Love, trusting and endearing love, is the very breath of her existence. She has deliberately chosen Vicentio to be lord of her life--the home and temple of her thoughts and affections--and nothing can turn them aside from their course. He may discard her, but she cannot forsake him.

Of the language of the play we must speak in terms of censure. It is everywhere disfigured by marks of feebleness and haste. The imagery is frequently harsh and extravagant, or far-fetched and affected, or made up of mere commonplaces.

It would be difficult for a play to be better acted throughout, than this was on its first presentation at Covent Garden. Mr. Macready's Ludovico displayed finished judgment in every part. Some passages of it were very fine--particularly those in which he resumes his natural haughty and ambitious character, after he has been hypocritically humbled before the King. Mr. Young played Colonna in a fine, free, loose, oriental style; and he gave the declamatory parts with great power. The young and high-spirited Vicentio was also extremely well adapted to Mr. C. Kemble. But Miss O'Neill in Evadne, was really and truly herself. The character is better suited to her powers than any she has yet played, except, perhaps, Julia and Desdemona.

This play is rather better known to the frequenters of the provincial theatres than to those of the metro-

> polis; but it has merits and capabilities, which will redeem it from obscurity. Remarkable effect is given to the character of Evadne by Mrs. Shaw, whose fine talents ought to be oftener exerted in this and kindred parts. This play was originally produced at Covent Garden, in 1818.[68]

Sheil's assertion that his play is original in "the incidents, situations, distribution, characters, and language" is true, and the action is simplified and reduced to one temptation. It follows the plot, really, of but the first half of The Traitor. Evadne herself is based on Amidea, The King of Naples, on the Duke; Ludovico, on Lorenzo; Colonna, on Sciarrha; Vicentio, here a much more important part, on Pisano. The other characters do not appear, although Spalatro has a function not unlike that of Petruchio, and Olivia is based on Oriana to the extent that is Olivia whom Vicentio is going to marry. The chief clue from Shirley which Sheil has taken for Colonna's character is Sciarrha's pride of family. This appears many times in The Traitor, and is usually commented on in my notes. In Evadne, however, the trait is still further developed, so that the whole last act takes place in

> A vast Hall in Colonna's Palace, filled with Statues [of ancestors].--The moon streams in through the Gothic windows, and appears to fall upon the Statues. A Chamber-door at back.[69]

The play is a very bad nineteenth-century blank-verse tragedy; so bad, in fact, that it has been a great comfort to me when I have thought of how hollow and second-rate The Traitor itself really is. Evadne is full, however, of theatrical claptrap such as the statues in the last act, and it is easy to see why it should have been a success. It is particularly interesting to the student of The Traitor because it shows the nineteenth-century adaptation of the material. Thus, with 1692 and Evadne, which was played as late as 1881,[70] there is a two-hundred and fifty-year record of the play, and indirectly of the audiences which applauded it.

---

[68] French, pp. [A2]^{r}, vi-vii.

[69] French, p. 49.

[70] Cf. pp. xxxi-xxxiii